PERSONNEL POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND CRITERIA
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
2016-17

I. The Personnel Process for Tenure-track and Temporary Members of the Philosophy Department: An Overview

1. Candidates are subject to a "Periodic Evaluation," a "Performance Review," or a "Range Elevation" Review. A **Performance Review for Tenure-track faculty** contains a Recommendation for or against retention, tenure, or promotion. A **Periodic Evaluation** contains no recommendation. It is intended to help the candidate improve so that he or she may have a positive Performance Review when it is time for one. A **Range Elevation Review** contains a Recommendation for or against range elevation.

2. Within the department the reviews are conducted by the Department Personnel Committee and by the Department Chair, who has the option of serving as a member of the Personnel Committee and not having a separate level of review or writing a separate report. The levels of review beyond the department include, in order, the College Personnel Committee, the College Dean, and the University Provost. (The procedure followed by the department is set forth below.)

II. Department Procedure

1. Each spring the department shall select a **Personnel Committee** whose function is to make scheduled Periodic Evaluations, Performance Reviews, and Range Elevation Reviews. In the Philosophy Department, the Personnel Committee also ranks lecturers, where required by university policy. The committee shall consist of three eligible members of the faculty, preferably but not necessarily from within the department. The selection process is set by university policy and the department constitution. Eligibility requirements are set by university policy. The department chair can elect to serve as one of the three members of the committee, and if he or she does so, the department shall select only two other faculty members to complete the committee.

2. The committee shall select a committee chair, whose function shall be to coordinate committee business.

3. As early as possible in September, the committee and the candidate shall be furnished with a schedule of pertinent deadlines for reviews to be conducted during the academic year.

4. The committee shall arrange for one or more members to observe a class taught by each candidate. Each candidate shall have at least one class observed during the period of review. The observer shall write a report of no more than one page in length, for inclusion in the RTP dossier of the candidate (explained later). The report shall be both descriptive and evaluative.

5. At his or her option, the department chair may also observe a class taught by a candidate, and write an observation report.

6. The candidate has the option of arranging for other members of the faculty, or others, to observe and report on a class.

7. By the deadline in the schedule, the candidate shall submit an updated **"RTP dossier."** The RTP dossier, also called the **"Working Personnel Action File" (WPAF)** is a binder provided by the college office that contains specific instructions about the documents required in the dossier. The candidate shall follow these instructions in completing the RTP dossier. However, the "Narrative" (section III of the RTP Dossier) shall be expanded to include a brief discussion of the candidate's record in the category of Other Contributions to the University and Community, designed to assist reviewers in evaluating his or her service record.

8. The candidate shall also submit a supplemental binders, to be kept in the department office during the period of review, with supplementary support material. Candidates may include whatever material they think will help reviewers appraise their record, but the evidentiary material that reviewers must consider is listed below, and candidates should include this material in the second binder.

9. Based on (a) the contents of the dossier and supplemental binders, (b) the class observation report mentioned above, and (c) other material in the candidate's **"Personal Action File"** (kept in the college office), and using criteria set forth below, the committee shall compose a draft **Periodic Evaluation Report,** draft **Performance Review Report/Recommendation,** or draft Range Elevation Review Report/Recommendation.

10. The committee will interview the candidate, with the department chair present at his or her option, using the draft Report/Recommendation mentioned in the preceding item as the basis for the interview. The purpose of the interview shall be to enable the committee to revise the Report/Recommendation so that it will be completely accurate and fully reflect the candidate's record. The committee shall provide the candidate with a copy of the draft report/recommendation prior to the interview.

11. After the interview, the committee will issue a final report/recommendation to the department chair, unless he or she is functioning as a member of the committee. If the chair is functioning as a member of the committee, the report/recommendation will be sent to the College Committee; if the department chair has not chosen to be a member of the committee, he or she shall write a separate report/recommendation and forward both it and the committee's report/recommendation to the College Committee.

12. The candidate shall have whatever rights of review are set forth in university policy.

III. General Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

1. In Periodic Evaluations and Performance Reviews of Tenure-track faculty the candidate is considered in four areas:
   (a) **Instruction** (also referred to in various documents as "Teaching Effectiveness"),
   (b) **Professional Growth and Achievement,**
   (c) **Other Contributions to the University and Community,** and
   (d) **Contributions to the Strategic Plan of the Department, College, and University**.
   In a Performance Review, the candidate's record in each of the first three of these four areas is rated in the Report/Recommendation that accompanies the review as either "superior," "effective," "adequate" or "inadequate." These terms are explained below. The ratings determine whether or not the candidate is recommended for retention, tenure, or promotion.

2. To receive a recommendation for promotion, a candidate normally must receive a "superior" rating in at least two of the three rated areas of evaluation. In rare cases it may be possible to receive a recommendation for promotion with only one "superior" rating, if the candidate's record in that area is truly exceptional.

3. To receive a recommendation for tenure, a candidate normally must receive a "superior" rating in at least two of the rated areas of evaluation. In rare cases, it may be possible to receive a recommendation for tenure with only one "superior" rating, if the candidate's record in that area is truly exceptional and the candidate makes a significant contribution to the strategic interests of the department, college, or university.
4. Although a rating of "Adequate" in the area of Instruction is sufficient for retention, a recommendation for tenure or promotion requires a higher rating.
5. No candidate can be recommended for tenure or promotion if he or she is rated as "inadequate" in any rated area.
6. To be recommended for early tenure or early promotion, a candidate must be rated as "superior" in all three rated areas.

IV. General Criteria for Range Elevations

1. Elevation to the range of Lecturer B or above requires an M.A. or other relevant degree beyond a Bachelor's. Graduate work considered "ABD" may also be sufficient.
2. Candidates shall submit an application along with a Working Personnel Action File. The application shall consist of a written letter or memorandum clearly stating the applicant's request, a complete vita, and a description of the nature of his/her professional development since the initial appointment or last range elevation, whichever is more recent.
3. Criteria for range elevations for temporary faculty hired on a twelve-unit base shall be the same used for promotion of tenure-track faculty, with appropriate consideration given to the extent of employment, release time, available funding, and work load (class sizes).
4. Temporary faculty hired on a fifteen-unit base shall have the choice of being considered either:
   (a) By the same criteria used for promotion of tenure-track faculty (with appropriate consideration given to the extent of employment, release time, available funding, and work load (class sizes)); or
   (b) According to ratings in the following two areas:
      (i) Instruction, and
      (ii) Professional Activities and Development
      In each of these two areas the candidate's record is rated in the Report/Recommendation that accompanies the Range Elevation Review as "superior," "effective," "adequate" or "inadequate." These terms are explained in V and IX below. To receive a recommendation for range elevation, a candidate choosing this option must receive a "superior" rating in at least one of the two rated areas of evaluation, and at least an "effective" rating in the other. In rare cases, it may be possible to receive a recommendation for range elevation with only two "effective" ratings, if the candidate makes a significant contribution to the strategic interests of the department, college, or university.

V. Specific criteria for ratings: Instruction

1. Ratings shall be based on evidence in the following categories: narrative from "RTP Dossier"; observation reports; student evaluations; course materials including syllabi, supplements, representative exams, papers, or other assessment instruments together with representative grade records and comments to students; documentation of teaching-related research or study; documentation of participation in seminars, conferences, institutes, and workshops; documentation of teaching-related prizes, awards, grants, or other forms of recognition; and other evidence the candidate thinks will be useful to the committee in evaluating the candidate's record. In general, the candidate should provide evidence that makes his/her pedagogical objectives clear and demonstrates the extent to which he/she achieves these objectives, and offer plans for revising pedagogical strategies if the objectives are not met.
2. Items counted under "Instruction" shall not be counted under other areas of review.
3. Observation reports by members of the committee shall carry more weight than reports by others; observation reports by members of the department faculty shall carry more weight than reports by faculty members outside the department or by others, or by student evaluations.
4. The committee shall rate the candidate in the light of difficulty of course material, number of new preparations, number of students, and area of expertise
5. A "**superior**" rating in this category shall reflect consummate professionalism and an unambiguous and consistent record of exceptional skill as an educator, based on the above considerations.
6. An "**effective**" rating shall reflect substantial professionalism and competence as an educator. Only a minor degree of unevenness in the evidentiary record is consistent with a designation at this level.
7. An "**adequate**" rating reflects a satisfactory level of professionalism and competence. Unevenness in the evidentiary record is consistent with this designation, provided that the record on balance is clearly positive.
8. An "**inadequate**" rating is appropriate when the evidence does not demonstrate at least an adequate level of professionalism and competence.

VI. Specific Criteria for ratings: Professional Growth and Achievement

1. Ratings shall be based on the following categories of evidence: Publications; citations in other scholarly work; documentation of scholarly presentations at academic gatherings or to the general public; documentation of editorial work; documentation of scholarship-related prizes, awards, and other honors, including grants and fellowships; documentation of activity in professional organizations and of membership on boards; documentation of participation in conferences, seminars, workshops, and institutes; documentation of service on committees of professional organizations; documentation of professional consultations, including commissioned book reviews; documentation of software development; and other evidence the candidate thinks will be useful to the committee in evaluating his/her professional record.
2. Items counted under "Professional Growth and Achievement" shall not be counted under other areas of review.
3. Merit of each item shall be evaluated with respect to both quality and relative weight. For example, a presentation to CAPE would carry less weight than a paper published in a professional journal.

4. A "**superior**" rating reflects consummate professionalism and significant scholarly achievement. To illustrate, a scholarly book published by a university press, or two articles published in such journals as <u>American Philosophical Quarterly</u> or <u>Ethics</u> or the equivalent, would more than qualify.
5. An "**effective**" rating reflects substantial significant scholarly achievement. No record that does not include at least one refereed or invited publication in a philosophical venue can qualify as "effective."
6. An "**adequate**" rating reflects scholarly achievement but not necessarily publication. To illustrate, a series of scholarly presentations judged to be of high quality might qualify, even if publication did not result.
7. An "**inadequate**" rating reflects little or no scholarly achievement.
8. In view of their prestigious nature, papers accepted for the main program at an APA division meeting will be accepted as equal in weight to articles published in a secondary refereed scholarly philosophy journal.
9. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide the committee with any additional information about professional accomplishments that he/she thinks the Committee should consider. For example, additional information might include published reviews, support letters from experts or from an anthology editor, and journal acceptance rates.

VII. Specific Criteria for ratings: Other Contributions to the University and Community

1. Ratings shall be based on the following categories of evidence, if documented: participation in a university, college, or department committee; administrative assignment including department chair, directing CAPE or the Humanities Center; coordinating the critical thinking program or an upper division theme or similar entity; advising students, student organizations, honor's projects, and internships; and mentoring faculty.
2. Relevant evidence shall also include, if documented, participation in conferences, workshops, forums, panels, and debates; community service; and other evidence the candidate thinks will be useful to the committee in evaluating his/her record.
3. Items counted under "Other Contributions to the University or Community" shall not be counted under other areas of review
4. A rating of "**superior**" reflects a continuous and consistent high level of involvement in categories listed above.
5. A rating of "**effective**" reflects all but continuous and consistent high level involvement. Further, the department regards faculty involvement in department affairs as essential to the vitality of the department. A minimum threshold for an "effective" rating in this category is regular attendance at department meetings and functions, including visits and presentations by guests of the department and student clubs and by candidates for positions, as well as student club meetings where appropriate; and participating in department discussions.
6. A rating of " **adequate**" reflects a record that is better than sporadic but less than continuous. This rating shall not require more than an infrequent assumption of key roles on committees.
7. A rating of "**inadequate**" reflects a service record that at best is sporadic.

VIII. Contribution to Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department, College, and University

1. While candidates are not rated in this category, their contribution must nevertheless be discussed, and, where appropriate, evaluated.
2. Candidates must be competent in the teaching area(s) specified when they were hired.
3. In addition, candidates must be willing to acquire new abilities and teach well in new and unexpected teaching assignments.
4. If a candidate's abilities are unusual, difficult to replace, or of special importance to the department, college, or university, this fact shall be noted in the evaluation.

IX. Optional Specific Criteria for ratings: Professional Activities and Development for range elevations of temporary faculty hired on a 15-unit base

1. Professional activities and development must be appropriate to the instructional assignment, including likely future assignments. Significantly more weight will be given if there is evidence that the professional activities have been incorporated into instruction in ways that have improved it, with documentation through syllabi, lecture notes, student evaluations, or other means.
2. Merit of each item shall be evaluated with respect to both quality and relative weight. For example, a presentation to CAPE would carry less weight than a paper published in a professional journal.
3. Ratings shall be based on the categories of evidence, if documented, listed in VI and VII above, as well as unpublished writings, course work, personal research, or instructional training.
4. A "**superior**" rating reflects a continuous and consistent high level of activity, beyond accumulated teaching experience. To illustrate, each of the following would be sufficient for a "superior" rating:
   a. Reading fifteen books of scholarly philosophy to keep current and improve instruction, with documentation through reading notes, changes in syllabi, revised lecture notes, and/or unpublished review essays.
   b. Publishing three book reviews in philosophy journals, or three articles in pedagogical journals such as Teaching Philosophy, Teaching Ethics, or the APA Newsletter on Teaching Philosophy, or a college textbook, or an anthology required for classes at three or more universities.
   c. Presenting three juried conference talks on philosophical topics related to instructional assignment or pedagogy.
   d. Eighteen hours of pedagogical training at teaching conferences (such as CELT or a Lilly Conference on College Teaching), along with evidence of the incorporation of the training into instruction in ways that have substantially changed and improved it.
   e. Development of interactive WebCT teaching strategies, such as discussion groups and self-guided learning quizzes, for three or more courses.
   Any comparable level of professional development, involving a combination of these or other kinds of professional activities, would also be sufficient for a "superior" rating in Professional Activities and Development.

5. An "**effective**" rating reflects regular and substantial professional activities and development, beyond accumulated teaching experience. To illustrate, 2/3 of the accomplishments in any one of 4.a. – 4.e. would be sufficient for an "effective" rating, viz. ten books, two book reviews, etc.
6. An "**adequate**" rating reflects occasional professional activities. To illustrate, presenting one non-juried talk, attending two teaching conferences, and substantially modifying a single course's readings might qualify.
7. An "**inadequate**" rating reflects little or no professional activities or development.
8. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide the committee with any additional information and documentation about professional activities or development that he/she thinks the Committee should consider. For example, the candidate might describe any new information or strategies used in the classroom, and provide documentation through syllabi, handouts, and/or student work.

X.   Search Policies and Procedures - Tenure Track Searches

1. All tenured and probationary faculty in the Department shall constitute the Search Committee for a tenure-track hire.
2. The AOS and AOC for a tenure-track hire must be approved by a majority of the Search Committee.
3. The Search Committee shall elect a Search Subcommittee consisting of three members of the department, plus the Department Chair. The Search Subcommittee is tasked with completing the position description, selecting and interviewing first-round candidates, and the basic operations of the search.
4. The Search Subcommittee shall recommend to the Department Search Committee a list of candidates for on-campus visits, which the Search Committee may approve or reject. The Search Subcommittee shall also recommend to the Department Search Committee a ranking of finalists for the Authorization to Extend an Offer, which the Search Committee may approve or reject.
5. The recommendations for on-campus visits and the ranking of finalists for the Authorization to Extend an Offer must be approved by a majority of the members of the Search Committee.

6. The Search Subcommittee shall elect a chair by majority vote. The Subcommittee chair will call meetings, and work with the Department Chair to ensure the Subcommittee follows administrative policy and law.
7. The Search Subcommittee shall elect a secretary to take notes. The secretary shall distribute the notes to all Subcommittee members, and deliver a copy to the department's Administrative Support Coordinator to put in a permanent file. Notes shall only include the date, attendance, agenda, and any votes or decisions, not discussion.
8. Decisions of the Search Subcommittee shall be determined by a majority vote. Ties shall be decided by the Department Chair.